

THE HONORABLE BARBARA J. ROTHSTEIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

WSOU INVESTMENTS, LLC d/b/a BRAZOS  
LICENSING AND DEVELOPMENT,

Plaintiff,

v.

F5 NETWORKS, INC.,

Defendant.

No. 2:20-cv-1878-BJR

**F5 NETWORKS, INC.'S ANSWER  
TO COMPLAINT**

Defendant F5 Networks, Inc. ("F5" or "Defendant"), by and through its attorneys, respectfully submits this Answer and Affirmative Defenses to Plaintiff's Complaint for Patent Infringement (the "Complaint") filed September 15, 2020 (D.I. 1), by Plaintiff WSOU Investments, LLC d/b/a Brazos Licensing and Development ("WSOU" or "Plaintiff").

The headings below track those used in the Complaint and are for convenience only. They do not constitute any part of F5's Answer to the Complaint or any admission by F5 as to the truth of the matters asserted. F5 further states that anything in the Complaint that is not expressly admitted is hereby denied.

**ANSWER TO THE COMPLAINT**

**Parties**

1. F5 is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of

1 the allegations in this paragraph and therefore denies all such allegations.

2 2. F5 is incorporated in Washington and its headquarters are at 801 5th Ave, Seattle,  
3 WA 98104. F5 has a regional office at 11911 Freedom Dr. #950 Reston, VA 20190. F5 denies  
4 the remaining allegations in this paragraph.

5 **Jurisdiction**

6 3. F5 admits that the Complaint is styled as an action for patent infringement arising  
7 under Title 35 of the United States Code.

8 4. F5 admits that the Complaint is styled as an action for patent infringement over  
9 which the Court has exclusive subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

10 5. F5 does not contest that this Court, in the Western District of Washington, has  
11 personal jurisdiction over F5 for purposes of this action. F5 denies the remaining allegations of  
12 this paragraph.

13 **Venue**

14 6. F5 admits that venue is proper in this Court for purposes of this action. F5 denies  
15 the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

16 **Patent-In-Suit**

17 7. F5 is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of  
18 the allegations in this paragraph and therefore denies all such allegations.

19 **The '884 patent**

20 8. F5 admits a purported copy of U.S. Patent No. 7,953,884 (“the ’844 patent” or  
21 “Asserted Patent”) attached to the Complaint as Exhibit 1 indicates that it is entitled “Method and  
22 apparatus for overload control and audit in a resource control and management system,” it issued  
23 on May 31, 2011, and the application leading to the ’844 patent was filed on April 9, 2007. F5  
24 denies any remaining allegations of this paragraph.

25 9. Denied.  
26

**COUNT 1: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '884 PATENT**

10. F5 incorporates by reference each of its responses set forth in the paragraphs above as if fully set forth herein.

11. Denied.

12. Denied.

13. F5 admits it was served with the Complaint. F5 denies the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

14. Denied.

15. Denied.

16. Denied.

17. F5 admits that Exhibit 2 to the Complaint purports to compare claims of the '844 patent to F5's "BIG-IP System." F5 denies the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

18. F5 admits a pleading may adopt an exhibit by reference to the extent allowed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 10(c).

19. Denied.

**Jury Demand**

20. WSOU's demand for a jury trial does not require a response from F5.

**WSOU's Prayer for Relief**

To the extent any response is required to any paragraph of WSOU's Prayer for Relief, including without limitation its statements labeled A-F(iii), F5 denies that WSOU is entitled to any relief from F5 and denies any allegations underlying or stated in WSOU's requested relief.

**AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

Subject to the responses above, F5 alleges and asserts the following defenses in response to the allegations, undertaking the burden of proof only as to those defenses deemed affirmative defenses by law and without reducing or removing WSOU's burden of proof on its affirmative claims against F5, regardless of how such defenses are denominated herein. In addition to the

1 affirmative defenses described below, F5 specifically reserves all right to allege additional  
2 affirmative defenses that become known through the course of discovery.

3 **First Affirmative Defense**

4 21. F5 does not, has not, and will not infringe, literally or under the doctrine of  
5 equivalents, willfully or otherwise, any valid, properly construed claim of the Asserted Patent,  
6 either directly, indirectly, contributorily, by inducement, or in any other manner.

7 **Second Affirmative Defense**

8 22. Each claim of the Asserted Patent is invalid for failure to comply with one or more  
9 of the statutory requirements specified in Title 35 of the United States Code, including, but not  
10 limited to 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

11 **Third Affirmative Defense**

12 23. To the extent that WSOU and any predecessors in interest to the Asserted Patent  
13 failed to properly mark any of their relevant products as required by 35 U.S.C. § 287, or otherwise  
14 give proper notice that F5's actions allegedly infringed the Asserted Patent, F5 is not liable to  
15 WSOU for the acts alleged to have been performed before it received actual notice that it was  
16 allegedly infringing the Asserted Patent.

17 **Fourth Affirmative Defense**

18 24. WSOU's claims for damages are statutorily limited or barred by 35 U.S.C. §§ 286  
19 and 287. WSOU is further barred under 35 U.S.C. § 288 from recovering costs associated with its  
20 action.

21 **Fifth Affirmative Defense**

22 25. WSOU's claims are barred, in whole or in part, based upon prosecution history  
23 estoppel, prosecution history disclaimer, and/or the internally inconsistent litigation positions  
24 WSOU has explicitly or implicitly taken with respect to the Asserted Patent in proceedings before  
25 the USPTO in the prosecution or amendment of the Asserted Patent. As a result, WSOU is  
26 estopped to maintain that the claims of the Asserted Patent are broad enough to cover any F5

1 product alleged to infringe the Asserted Patent, either literally or by application of the doctrine of  
2 equivalents.

### 3 **Sixth Affirmative Defense**

4 26. The claims of the Asserted Patent are not entitled to a scope sufficient to encompass  
5 any of the allegedly infringing acts practiced by F5.

### 6 **Seventh Affirmative Defense**

7 27. WSOU is precluded from recovering its reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, and/or  
8 increased damages under 35 U.S.C. §§ 284 or 285.

### 9 **Reservation of Rights**

10 F5 expressly reserves the right to assert any other legal or equitable defenses to which it is  
11 shown to be entitled, including all affirmative defenses under Rule 8(c) of the Federal Rules of  
12 Civil Procedure, the Patent Laws of the United States, and any other defenses that may now exist  
13 or in the future be available based on discovery or further factual investigation in this case.

### 14 **F5'S COUNTERCLAIMS**

15 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 13, Defendant and now Counter-Plaintiff F5,  
16 brings these Counterclaims against Plaintiff and now Counter-Defendant WSOU. F5 seeks  
17 declaratory relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, declaring United States Patent No.  
18 7,953,884 (the "'844 Patent") invalid, unenforceable, and not infringed by F5.

### 19 **The Parties**

20 1. Counterclaim Plaintiff F5 Networks, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing  
21 under the laws of the State of Washington with its corporate headquarters at 801 5th Ave, Seattle,  
22 WA 98104.

23 2. Upon information and belief based on Paragraph 1 of the Complaint as pleaded by  
24 WSOU, Counterclaim Defendant WSOU is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of  
25 business at 605 Austin Avenue, Suite 6, Waco, Texas 76701.

### 26 **Jurisdiction and Venue**

3. These counterclaims arise under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35, United States Code. The jurisdiction of this Court is proper under at least 35 U.S.C. § 271 et seq., and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, 1367, 2201, and 2202.

4. WSOU has consented to the personal jurisdiction of this Court by at least pursuing its action for patent infringement in this District and stipulating to venue in this District (Dkt. 15).

5. Based on WSOU's conduct in this action, venue is proper in this District pursuant to at least 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

### **COUNT I**

#### **Declaration of Non-Infringement of the '844 Patent**

6. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between the parties as to F5's non-infringement of the '844 Patent based on WSOU's filing of the Complaint in this action and F5's Answer and Affirmative Defenses above.

7. F5 does not infringe at least claim 11 of the '844 Patent, either directly or indirectly, and either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, through its use or incorporation of any technology, including the Exemplary Defendant Products as defined by WSOU. For example, the accused instrumentality does not include "determining a reduction percentage that corresponds with a percentage of calls that will be blocked" or any equivalent thereof or "wherein determining the reduction percentage is based, at least in part, on available central processing unit memory" or any equivalent therefor, and thus does not infringe the '844 Patent.

8. Pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq., F5 seeks a declaration that F5 has not infringed and does not infringe any claim of the '844 Patent under any theory, including directly (whether individually or jointly) and indirectly (whether contributorily or by inducement).

### **COUNT II**

#### **Declaration of Invalidity of the '844 Patent**

9. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between the parties as to the invalidity

1 of the '844 Patent based on WSOU's filing of the Complaint in this action and F5's Answer and  
2 Affirmative Defenses above.

3 10. The claims of the '844 Patent are invalid for failure to satisfy one or more of the  
4 requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code, including, without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§  
5 101–103 and 112. For example, the claims of the '844 patent are anticipated and/or rendered  
6 obvious by the prior art. In another example, the claims lack written description, are not enabled,  
7 and/or are not sufficiently definite.

8 11. Pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq., F5  
9 seeks a declaration that all claims of the '844 patent are invalid for failure to comply with one or  
10 more of the requirements of United States Code, Title 35, including without limitation 35 U.S.C.  
11 §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112.

### 12 **JURY DEMAND**

13 Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, F5 hereby demands trial by  
14 jury on all triable issues in WSOU's Complaint and F5's Answer, Affirmative Defenses, and  
15 Counterclaims.

### 16 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

17 WHEREFORE, F5 respectfully prays for the following relief:

- 18 a. A dismissal with prejudice of WSOU's Complaint against F5;
- 19 b. A judgment in favor of F5 on all of its Counterclaims;
- 20 c. A judgment that WSOU is not entitled to any relief whatsoever, whether in law or  
21 equity or otherwise, from its suit against F5;
- 22 d. A declaration that the claims of the '844 patent are invalid for failure to meet the  
23 conditions of patentability and/or otherwise comply with one or more of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102,  
24 103, and 112;
- 25 e. A declaration that F5 has not infringed (directly, indirectly, willfully, literally  
26 and/or under the doctrine of equivalents) any valid and enforceable claim of the '844 patent;

1 f. A declaration that this case is exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and an award to  
2 F5 of its reasonable cost and attorneys' fees; and

3 g. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

4  
5 DATED: February 26, 2021

/s/ Ramsey M. Al-Salam

/s/ Stevan R. Stark

Ramsey M. Al-Salam, WSBA No. 18822

RAlsalam@perkinscoie.com

Stevan R. Stark, WSBA No. 39639

SStark@perkinscoie.com

PERKINS COIE LLP

1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900

Seattle, WA 98101-3099

Tel: 206-359-8000

/s/ Shane Brun

Shane Brun (*admitted pro hac vice*)

sbrun@kslaw.com

KING & SPALDING LLP

601 S. California Ave., Suite 100

Palo Alto, CA 94304

Tel: 415-318-1245

/s/ Angela C. Tarasi

Angela C. Tarasi (*admitted pro hac vice*)

atarasi@kslaw.com

KING & SPALDING LLP

1400 16th Street

16 Market Square, Suite 400

Denver, CO 80202

Tel: 720-535-2300

***Attorneys for Defendant F5 Networks, Inc.***



**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on February 26, 2021, I caused copies of the foregoing document to be served via CM/ECF to the counsel of record in this matter.

/s/ Stevan R. Stark  
Stevan R. Stark